

# Review of: "Women In Slum Risking Their Safety To Access And Usage Of Basic Water And Sanitation Facilities"

Benbella Dektar

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The title needs some modification to give it more context. As it appears now, it is blunt and not tailored to the study. Consider modifying to "Risks Associated with Access and Usage of Basic Water and Sanitation Facilities by Women in Slum Dwellings"

The objectives of the study are not outlined. It will be great to have the objectives clearly stated

The methodology used is unclear. The article states that "The current paper is a review of previous research papers and the methods used in addressing women's safety in slums while using water and basic sanitation facilities." This means that the study is a document review. The article goes on to contradict itself by saying that "The total sample size studied through the literature was 6663 (number of people in slum households)." It is therefore not clear whether this was document review or a cross sectional study involving human subjects. The article does not indicate how they arrived at the said sample size of 6663 people. What were the criteria for the different sample sizes?

Surprisingly, this study goes on to include results under the methodology section in form of tables. Since the tables show results, I advise that the authors have the tables in the results section.

The methodology section of this study lacks structure. I advise that the authors structure the methodology as follows:

3.1 Study design

3.2 Study area

3.3 Study population

3.4 Sample size determination (if applicable)

3.5 Data collection methods and management

3.6 Data analysis

3.7 Ethical Considerations (*This should include how consent was obtained from study participants. It should also clearly indicate the approval of an Ethics Committee or IRB with the reference number*)

The authors do not indicate the timeline of the study, i.e., when it started and when it ended.

The data analysis section included in the article does not explicitly indicate which data analysis software and version were

used. It also doesn't indicate which variables were analysed and which statistical tests were run.

The authors do not explicitly indicate what their results are in the results and discussion section of the article. For example, they mention that "Some women claimed that the lack of privacy in public restrooms led them to use bags..." The use of the word 'some' leaves a lot to be desired especially when analysis was done. Rather than saying 'some,' 'many,' 'few,' kindly use the percentage of women from your analysis.

I also advise that the authors separate the Results and Discussion sections so that the discussion is a standalone section with clear arguments on literature which agrees and disagrees with your findings.

Kindly include the study limitations before the conclusion.

Rather than calling them suggestions, please revise to Recommendations. It is also better to have the recommendations written in a concise manner and numbered for clarity. Do not cite literature in the recommendations section.